

Contents

Page

133	THE BURDEN OF THE BERRIGANS	<i>Edward Duff, S.J.</i>
159	STUDENT WORLD AND RELIGIOUS LIFE	<i>The Editor</i>
175	1971: A CRITICAL YEAR	<i>J. M. Jackson</i>
148	"THAT HOPE THAT IS IN YOU"	<i>Francis Fenn, S.J.</i>
169	THE INTERNATIONAL OFFICE	<i>Hamish Fraser</i>
153	LATIN AMERICAN SAMBA	<i>E. L. Way</i>
130	INFLATION AND THE UNIONS	<i>The Editor</i>
183	ANY QUESTIONS?	<i>William Lawson, S.J.</i>
188	BOOK REVIEW	

CHRISTIAN ORDER is a monthly magazine devoted to the promulgation of Catholic Social Teaching and incisive comment on current affairs in Church and State; at home and abroad; in the political, social and industrial fields.

It is published by Father Paul Crane, S.J., from 65, Belgrave Road, London, S.W.1. This is the sole postal address to which all communications concerning *Christian Order* should be sent.

Christian Order is obtainable only by subscription and from this address. In the case of those desiring more than one copy, these are obtainable at the subscription rate and should be paid for in advance.

The annual subscription to *Christian Order* is £1 in the United Kingdom and Republic of Ireland; \$3.00 in the United States, Canada and Australia; elsewhere, according to the approximate sterling rate of exchange, in the currency of the country concerned or any convenient currency.

If You Change Your Address: Please let us know two or three weeks ahead if possible and please send us both new and old addresses. Thank you.

Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane S J

VOLUME 12

MARCH 1971

NUMBER 3

Inflation and the Unions

THE EDITOR

IT would be wrong, I think, to suppose that the *basic* cause of the inflation which has plagued this country for so long is to be found in rising wage claims. This is not to deny for a moment that rising wages are *a* cause of the present inflation. What I am suggesting here is that they are not the *fundamental* cause. To discover this one has to ask what it is *in particular* that has caused trade unionists to go on wanting increased wages since the end of the Second World War.

The answer to this question, simply put, is rising prices. One has next to ask why *in particular* prices have risen as they have done; and the answer to this comes back at you almost at once. It can be written down in three words — *rising government expenditure*. This has been Britain's post-war devil; and both Parties have been guilty whilst in power. What makes Mr. Heath's Administration remarkable is that it is the first not to have accepted massive and mounting public spending as a normal government occupation. Further, he and his colleagues are actually trying to

check public spending and cut it down. This is astounding. For this alone they deserve widespread public support.

It is very easy to see how mounting public expenditure is certain to produce spiralling prices in conditions of relatively full employment. For the effect of such spending is to loose onto the market for the daily things we need a flood of money paid, in the form of wages and salaries, to those engaged in making the things on which government is spending money and which, of their nature, are not amongst the things we need each day; in this sense that they cannot be eaten or worn now (roads, university and school buildings and electrified railway lines are all examples). As government spending increases, more and more money presses on the market for the things we need daily. Obviously, under such circumstances, their prices begin to rise. This is what lies at the back of the present inflation. This is its fundamental cause.

What, then, of rising wages? They are, I think, essentially a reaction to this kind of situation. Confronted, as he has been for the past twenty-five years, with ever-increasing rises in the prices of the things he needs to meet his daily needs, it is entirely natural that the worker should ask for higher wages and use the strength of his union to make sure he gets it. There is, really, no mystery here. The reaction is an obvious one, and the worker will be turned from it neither by appeals to his patriotism nor by the realisation that his demand for higher wages, being a result of higher prices produced by government over-spending, will lead to higher prices still and so on. His answer to this kind of argument is that he has to live and that, so long as he has the strength of his union behind him, he will continue to act in this fashion. And the reason why he and his leaders are so antagonistic to Mr. Carr's bill is precisely because they see it as an attack on their union strength, which they recognise as the only weapon they have for the defence of their standard of living against rising prices produced by ever-rising government spending.

It would seem to follow that though there is reason for

using all means to restrain wage demands in the short run, which is *now*; there is no reason at all for any government using such restraint as a permanent long-term policy. That way lies the Police State into which Mr. Wilson and his colleagues, wittingly or unwittingly, were taking us. The only way of eliminating inflation in a free society is to eliminate its cause. The cause is excessive and mounting government expenditure. Once this has been cut back — *far* more drastically than even Mr. Barber appears to contemplate at the present time — the wage situation will take care of itself and Mr. Carr's bill appear to trade unionists not as an attack on their standard of living, but as the positively beneficial instrument it was always intended to be.

CRIME AND POVERTY

"In every major city in the U.S. you will find that two-thirds of the arrests take place among only 2 per cent of the population.

"Where is that area in every city? Well, it's in the same place where infant mortality is four times higher than in the city as a whole; where the death rate is 25 per cent higher, where life expectancy is 10 years shorter . . . where education is poorest — the oldest school buildings, the most crowded and turbulent schoolrooms, the fewest certified teachers, the highest rate of dropouts; where the average formal schooling is four to six years less than for the city as a whole. Sixty per cent of the children in Watts in 1965 lived with only one, or neither, of their parents" (*Crime in America* by former Attorney General Ramsey Clark, 1970).

A measure of the notoriety at present enjoyed by the Berrigan brothers — one a Josephite priest and the other a Jesuit — is that, perhaps, most readers of this Review will have heard of them.

In the present article, Father Duff examines his conscience in the light of the Berrigan's trial and condemnation last year. Not everyone will agree with his verdict. The Editor is inclined not to himself: he would be far more severe, but he regards the article as of fascinating interest and worth careful study by readers.

It appeared last year in the quarterly magazine published by Holy Cross College, Worcester, Massachusetts for its Alumni. This accounts for some local references.

The Burden of the Berrigans

EDWARD DUFF, S.J.

A BROTHER of mine in religion is in the Federal Correctional Institution at Danbury, Connecticut. I have never met Daniel Berrigan, S.J. nor, given our differences of temperament and experience, is it sure that we would like one another. Yet Dan Berrigan is a personal problem. Not an embarrassment, mind you: he has been publicly certified as being in good standing as a priest and as a Jesuit by his Provincial Superior and enjoys undoubtedly the affectionate and enthusiastic endorsement of many (most?) of the younger members of the Society in the United States. It is not, then, his being in jail — along with his blood brother, Josephite Father Philip Berrigan — that is disconcerting. It is Dan Berrigan's spiritual stance and political posture that challenge me as a priest and as a political scientist. For my own clarity of mind, I must come to terms with the issues they personify and publicise. The Berrigans are a burden.

Why are You not There?

The burden would not be lightened by visiting my brother-Jesuit at Danbury, although I am old enough to recognise the project as listed among the Corporal Works of Mercy. I prefer not to risk the experience of Ralph Waldo Emerson calling at the Concord jail to see his friend, Henry Thoreau, sentenced for refusing to pay taxes to a town that supported drilling for the Mexican War, which he deemed a move to extend slavery.

The exponent of Self-Reliance was puzzled by the situation. "Henry," he asked, "why are you here?"

"Waldo, why are you *not* here?" was the curt reply.

Factually, Daniel Berrigan, S.J. is in the Danbury Federal Penitentiary because on May 17th, 1968, with eight others including his priest-brother, he invaded the offices of Local Board 33 on the second floor of the Knights of Columbus Hall in the Baltimore suburb of Catonsville. In a well-planned operation 300 files were hurriedly rifled, quickly dumped into wire trash-baskets and burned with homemade napalm in the parking lot amid prayers and the whirr of TV cameras. As to why he destroyed government property and interfered with the workings of the Selective Service System — the two counts on which the jury convicted him after a perfunctory, half-hour consideration — Daniel Berrigan, S.J. has been prolix and eloquent both at the trial and in many subsequent interviews, not least those given during the nearly four months, he evaded the F.B.I. after being ordered to prison on April 9th, 1970 following the rejection by the Supreme Court of his appeal in March 1970.

After having been sheltered by 37 different families in 12 cities, Daniel Berrigan, S.J. was captured on August 11th at the summer home on Block Island, R.I. of William Stringfellow, Episcopal lay theologian and lawyer whose years defending Harlem's poor are recounted in *My People Is the Enemy*. The book includes the caustic (and challenging) comment: "Christianity is about religion, not about life".

One of Dan Berrigan's courtroom explanations of his multiple motivation for the burning of the draft records

involved an excursus on St. Ignatius and his programme that "we (Jesuits) belonged actually in society, in the culture, in the schools, in the ghettos among the poor, as the servants of men and that it was there that we would find God or nowhere". Asked by defence counsel whether the Catonsville operation was "carrying out that philosophy of the Jesuit Order?", Daniel Berrigan affirmed: "May I say that, if that is not accepted as a substantial part of my action, then the action is eviscerated of all meaning and I should be committed for insanity".

"Why are you *not* here, Ed. Duff, S.J.?"

In an Open Letter to the Jesuits announcing, among more pertinent sentiments, that he did not propose to serve his sentence nor cease to resist the war, "to retire meekly to silence and isolation" Daniel Berrigan declared that such a course of action seemed to him "a betrayal of my love for the Society".

"Why are you *not* here, Ed. Duff, S.J.?"

Daniel Berrigan, S.J. is a poet and, as national awards attest, a very good poet. He is, then, a person of imaginative insight, a master of metaphor, a stylist of shining affirmation but, most significantly, he is an artist of acute and reasonable sensibility.

Incident in Hanoi

A couple of months before his trial, Father Berrigan had flown to Hanoi to accept a few American POW's the North Vietnamese régime had chosen to release. While he was in the city, a U.S. bombing raid forced all to flee to improvised shelters. The priest climbed down into the hole, an infant in his arms which was being fed all the while by its sister. In a poem he began composing on the spot the American Jesuit saw all the purpose of a better world and all the evil of our foreign policy caught up in the fate of that Oriental infant. Nor should one think that Berrigan arrived in Vietnam as an innocent abroad. He had examined, at first hand, the moral monstrosity of *apartheid* in South Africa and had talked with the survivors of the Sharpsville

massacre; during an enforced "vacation"; he had inspected the teeming *favellas*, the fetid offscourings of the burgeoning cities of Latin America; he had experienced the efforts of Catholicism to endure and adapt under oppression in East Europe. And now he sees American civilisation as ugly, menacing and irremediably corrupt. He anticipates, moreover, that all thoughtful men will come to "the dawning realisation that practically nothing of traditional civilised structure is functioning for human welfare. This is true of medicine, education, communication, arts, the Church, and indeed, God help us, the courts". Daniel Berrigan believes that the American political order has lost its moral legitimacy.

Am I Insensitive to Evil?

Since I do not share such an apocalyptic judgment, I must ask if an insensitiveness to evil is responsible. When Catherine Genovese returned late at night from her lunch-room-cashier's job to her apartment house on Austin Street in the New York suburb of Kew Gardens on March 13th, 1964, she was attacked by a man who stabbed and assaulted her on the street as she sought safety and finally killed her in an entryway. For more than an hour 38 neighbours watched the crime being committed without coming to her aid or calling the police. It is easy to forget Eric Fromm's observation that the opposite of love is not hate but apathy. Is apathy my trouble? Just before Christmas, 1961 I passed without second thought, American GI's lined up at the Thansanhut airport, Saigon. In the city I stayed at the Metropole, an old French-style hotel with ice-cream parlour style fans in the ceiling, across the square from the new air-conditioned Caravelle where the International Control Commission and the U.S. top brass relaxed. Accepted as *un Canadien de la langue anglaise* by the staff (an error to be encouraged in all countries), I was persuaded that all the people I met were already weary of war. Inevitably, I recalled the 1954 Geneva Conference I had covered as a journalist: the signing of the Accords at the Palais des Nations early in the morning of July 21st (the clock having

been stopped to enable French Premier Pierre Mendez-France to keep a promise to his parliament) ending eight years of military effort to regain a former colony; I recalled the ailing General Bedell Smith in his office at the Hotel de Rhone whom I unsuccessfully urged to attend a Pontifical Mass to signal, if not celebrate, the peace; in sullen fashion our Under-Secretary of State announced that the U.S. would not sign the Agreements, but would respect them. But President John F. Kennedy had declared in his Inaugural Address: "Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, in order to assure the survival and the success of liberty". A few days before my arrival in Saigon, Kennedy had written to President Diem that "we shall promptly increase our assistance to your defence . . ." The presence of GI's at the airport in 1961 then, seemed normal.

What Can I Do?

Nor, on reflection, was I disturbed for long — is "radicalised" the word? — by the *bustis* in Calcutta, those rabbit warrens for the wretched people fortunate to have some kind of a roof over their heads. An extraordinary Albanian nun, Mother Theresa, took me to her House for the Dying, two garage-like sheds beside a noisy pagan temple, where derelicts from the streets are brought and nursed, the unlucky ones recovering enough to return to the streets — to starve again. A \$10 handshake and the promise of publicity for her manifold charities unburdened me emotionally of Mother Theresa and the limitless human misery of Calcutta. Was I the levite who hurried along the road to Jericho (presumably on Jesuit business), untouched by the plight of those whose humanity had been plundered? But plundered by whom? And what was the possibility of effective action open to me?

At its last Commencement Holy Cross College awarded an honorary degree to Dom Helder Camara, Archbishop of Recife, Brazil, for his tireless advocacy of justice for the

underdeveloped world. Last May 23rd, Archbishop Camara, in the course of a public conference at Orleans in France, termed "scandalous" the sale of the Pompidou government of 16 Mirage-III fighter-bombers to his country, especially in view of the desperate needs of the poor. Given the documented evidence of tortures by the military régime in Brazil, Catholic and Protestant groups demanded the cancellation of the arms sale, two Catholics, a priest and a lay professor undertaking a two-week, public fast in protest. Their action was endorsed by the Bishop of Orleans, Guy-Marie Riobé, who declared: "It would not be honest to applaud Dom Helder and then let him alone bear the considerable risk of this matter without ourselves sharing on the spot the same struggle". The U.S. government sells arms to other governments, many of dubious origin and disputable legitimacy, at the rate of \$2 billion each year. Ostensibly to strengthen the collective defence of the West, such arms have been used in wars by opposing nations — Pakistan and India, Israel and Jordan. Deplore the practice though I do, I see no feasible, effective protest to stop the programme. Is this acquiescence in evil or spiritual sloth or passive co-operation.

Bleak Judgment

Father Berrigan's political pessimism is total. "American power", he tells us, "is locked into its method, its sleep-walking, its nightmare, its rampant and irreversible character. No change in the personnel of power seems to bring about any serious change in the functioning and direction of power, in the misuse and grinding under of human beings". A case can be argued for such a bleak judgment, but one wonders how the Berrigan brief would read beyond an enunciation of the failure to convince a judge and jury that a clear intent to stop the war in Vietnam merited an acquittal. From his brother, Philip, Dan Berrigan learned of the plight of black people in New Orleans and Baltimore, from several of his Catonsville co-defendants he heard brutal details of U.S. government support of oppressive, reactionary regimes in Latin America. But from his collegians at Cornell and from

the professional people — the professors and doctors and clergymen — who harboured him in the underground he scarcely encountered evidence of American power “grinding under of human beings”. When captured on Block Island, he was reading *The Trial and Death of Socrates*. Earlier he had told an interviewer: “. . . in the way of contemporary poetry I am particularly enjoying Allen Ginsberg and Denise Levertov”.

Is Poetry Enough?

This is all proper fare for a poet and poet's are in short supply these days. It seems, however, inadequate resource material for dire political assessments which invite (and expect) an analysis of how we got where we are and some suggestions as to what directions we should move in. The situation is too serious for stridency or hand-wringing.

Why We got Where We Are

We got where we are because of a decision, made early in the Kennedy Administration and supported routinely by our freely elected representatives, that — in addition to maintaining our nuclear superiority — this nation must be prepared to fight simultaneously two-and-a-half conventional wars, a major war in Europe, another in Asia and a brush-fire operation in Latin America. The result has been a blind distortion of national priorities with social decay at home accepted as the price of power abroad, with 70 cents of the tax dollar going for military or paramilitary expenditures and one in every five jobs dependent directly or indirectly on our military posture. This development has been fostered by intelligent men of good will, it has been rubber-stamped regularly by Congress, it has been supported by the trade unions and industry and accepted by the American citizenry. The issue, then, is immensely larger than the war in Vietnam. In fact, it is only now that we can see that our pursuit of world security has made it unsafe to walk the streets of our own cities, including the nation's capital, at night. We are pledged to defend 42

countries (our troops are stationed in no less than 30) and yet we face disintegration at home. The gravity of our situation was expressed in an editorial in the June *Fortune*, the monthly edited (it claims) for "the men in charge of change":

"For the first time, it is no longer possible to take for granted that the U.S. will somehow survive the crisis that grips it. The land will survive, of course, along with the machines and the people — or most of them. But no nation is merely, or mainly, an aggregate of its geography, its material assets and its warm bodies. At the core of the U.S., conferring identity, cohesion, belief and vitality, stands a Proposition, confirmed by eight generations of superb achievement that free men, despite differences of status, belief and interest, can govern themselves. Upon the survival of that proposition, depends any worthwhile future that an entity called the United States might have. And it is that Proposition — amazingly — which in the spring of 1970 has come to be at stake".

A Questionable View

Clouding the future of that Proposition has been a distortion of national goals in the exaltation of exorbitant military power, a process briefed in such current books as Richard J. Barnet's *The Economy of Death*, Seymour Moltman's *Pentagon Capitalism*, Senator William Proxmire's *Report from Wasteland*, Sidney Lens' *The Military-Industrial Complex*, Colonel James A. Donovan's *Militarism U.S.A.*, John K. Galbraith's *How to Control the Military* and George Thayer's *The War Business*. Such literature strikes me as more apposite to the serious protestors of the Vietnam war than the collected works of Mahatma Gandhi in the Berrigan library. For what, after all, is the American equivalent of a march to the sea to make your own salt, or weaving your own cloth for your own *dhoti* on your own spinning wheel, when the news of the preliminary award of the B-1 bomber (a programme estimated to cost eventually \$12 billion) to North American Rockwell Cor-

poration is headlined by the Los Angeles *Times* as "43,000 New Jobs"? Or when the only dispute in the Senate in September over \$2.5 billion for 30 new destroyers was whether half should be built at the Bath Iron Works in Senator Margaret Chase Smith's State of Maine or all of them at the Litton shipyards at Pascagoula in Armed Services Committee Chairman John Stennis' fief of Mississippi?

Ours is undoubtedly a society fearsomely preoccupied by war and mired in the making of ever more lethal and costly weapons and this to the crying neglect of urgent national problems. To say, however, that it has shut its ears to public challenge, that it is controlled by those "grinding under [of] human beings" is certainly questionable, not the least in view of the audience for Father Berrigan whose articles and interviews during his months evading arrest appeared in the *Saturday Review*, *Commonweal*, *New Yorker*, *New York Review of Books*, *Christian Century*, *New York Times Magazine*, and *Village Voice*, along with network appearances on The National Broadcasting Company and the National Educational Television, plus a play of his "The Trial of the Catonsville Nine" produced in Los Angeles.

Nothing beyond "No"

Believing that "the times are inexpressibly evil", Daniel Berrigan, S.J. believes also that they are irretrievably beyond lawful remedy. He asserts: "Let me say as plainly as I know how, I don't see as a political tactic that anything that might be called 'useful' is left to us, except civil disobedience. I say that openly. I am not supposed to say it—by the terms of my bond—but I say it anyway. I don't see anything remaining to us by way of confronting the warmakers, except civil disobedience".

Here is the American tradition of Henry David Thoreau updated. A poet, too, who claimed to hear "a different drummer", Thoreau insisted that "any man more right than his neighbour constitutes a majority of one", counselled using one's life as "a counter-friction to stop the machine", extolled John Brown, the insurrectionist, as "an angel of

light" and advocated "direct action" in the form of withdrawing one's allegiance to a government supporting and permitting slavery.

While Thoreau, as early as 1849, thought that "it is not too soon for honest men to rebel and revolutionize" because of the legal protection of slavery, his knowledge of (and interest in) the complex issues involved in the Civil War was slight; his "rebellion" was a token one.

(One could—mischievously—find a comparison more contemporary than Thoreau in President Nixon's enthusiasm for the film *Chisum*. To be sure, the "good guys", led by John Wayne, win—to Mr. Nixon's comfort—but they do so by taking the law into their own hands.)

What Daniel Berrigan, S.J. envisages beyond generalized civil disobedience, encouraging "a solid wall of conscience to confront the war makers", urging people to say "NO! courageously, constantly, clear sightedly", he has not told us. He underlines the spiritual problem at issue, since "man is unready for a human future. He has not grown those organs and resources which allow him to function in an alternate way, where he lives, and to reach out with public consequence". He speaks of a new form of human community, one no longer dominated and restricted by the limitations of the "nuclear family"; he hoped that he could build bridges to the Weathermen, (a student anarchist organisation, much like the *Narodniki* in 19th century Russia) and the Black Panthers; certainly as a priest he was pleased by his appeal to the New Left.

Such views—probably a cheap and unworthy thing to say of a brother Jesuit in jail — strike me as slightly Manichaeic and their expression somewhat gnostic.

Larger Purpose of the Catonsville Nine

At their trial, the Catonsville Nine argued their "non-criminal intent" in destroying the draft files, a plea that was disallowed. The facts were not in dispute: the Nine had alerted reporters and had prepared a press release in advance to assure maximum publicity and had waited

patiently for the arrival of the police to arrest them. Their purpose was larger than the temporary discommoding of an individual Selective Service Board. They surely must have realized that the inexorable workings of the draft system would automatically fill the gaps caused by the missing Catonsville records by increasing the calls of neighbouring Boards. (Did they advert, I wonder, to the possibility that they might be destroying the painfully compiled dossiers of some applying for Conscientious Objector status?) What they ambitioned was to subject a phase of national policy, the war in Vietnam, to judicial review. They had tried all other means. Philip Berrigan had prayed in front of the homes of the Joint Chiefs of Staff at Fort Myers, Virginia and of Secretary McNamara in Washington; he had talked with Secretary Rusk, interviewed Senators, given talks against the war across the country and, six months earlier, had poured blood on the draft files in the United States Custom House in Baltimore. Daniel Berrigan, from late 1965, had been co-chairman of "Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam"; he had been jailed in the aftermath of the march on the Pentagon at the time Philip, as one of the Baltimore Four, was defacing draft records with blood. Previous protests having failed, the Catonsville Nine would have the courts, the guardians of the American Constitution and the symbol of the country's civic righteousness, condemn the Executive branch of the government. By acquitting them the judiciary would, in effect, rule that the Vietnam war was illegal.

It was an empty effort. The prosecuting attorney conceded that in fact "reasonable men" could hold that the war is illegal, in violation of the U.S. Constitution, the U.N. Charter and the 1954 Geneva Accords. In charging the jury Judge Roszel Thomsen declared: "The law does not recognise political, religious, moral convictions, or some higher law, as justification for the commission of a crime, no matter how good the motive may be". In effect, the Judicial Branch of the government told the defendants to take their case to the public in the hope of influencing the

Legislative Branch (i.e. an already too compliant Congress) in order to restrain the Executive Branch. But this after a jail sentence for destroying government property and interfering with the draft that is keeping the war going. For, with the representatives of the people in Congress routinely voting massive appropriations for the war, it is excessive to pretend that it is merely an aberration of the Executive.

What Did the Berrigans Achieve?

What did the action of the Berrigans at Catonsville achieve? The question, though unfair, is unavoidable. It is unfair because the defendants made it clear that they felt morally compelled to make their protest in the form they did and were aware of the legal penalties. But was, as some allege, the tactic of burning draft records counter-productive? A full-page headline in the Holy Cross student newspaper *The Crusader* of May 8th announced "Strike voted 'to bring an end to the war'". Subsequently, a Gallup poll revealed that 82 per cent. of the American people disapproved of such forms of protest.

It might be remembered that, three days before the Catonsville episode, American and North Vietnamese delegates officially opened formal talks at Paris after six weeks of wrangling over the site. President Johnson had called for such talks on March 31st in return for his restriction of the bombing of North Vietnam in a broadcast announcing that he would not seek re-election, his career closed by an unpopular war.

During his underground days, Father Daniel Berrigan surfaced briefly as a guest preacher at the First United Methodist Church of Germantown, a Philadelphia suburb. His Sunday sermon was filmed for TV as were the reactions of some of his listeners. Three of the four people interviewed had never heard of him, despite the pastor's explicit introduction, and assumed that he was "a refractory cleric", "a defrocked priest or one of those who has left the Church". All three were elderly folk, plainly WASPA, i.e. White, Anglo-Saxon Protestants. The fourth,

a younger man, recognized the preacher, but said that, after considerable thought, his conscience dictated a different course.

American Catholicism and America's Status Quo

The Berrigans, then, have achieved at least this: they have challenged in the public mind the automatic identification of American Catholicism with the status quo, its alliance with prevailing patriotic causes, its ambition to be accepted, not so much as an alien value-system adjusting to a politically neutral environment, but as a group of citizens "just like everyone else". The example of the Berrigans raises the doubt that American Catholicism can be counted on to supply acolytes for *all* the shrines of the civic religion that is called the American Way of Life. In the past, our sympathies and our votes were deliverable on behalf of organised labour because its members were "our kind". (Or, as I once heard Reinhold Niebuhr explain, because the mill owners were Protestant.) Endeavouring to elude the hostility reserved for the poor and the late arrivals in God's Own Country, to escape the heritage of hyphenation (Irish-Americans! German-Americans! Polish-Americans!), we became, all too successfully, super-Americans, prompt to match the number of our Gold Star Mothers or our nominees for the All Star football line-up with any group in the country. One of "our kind" who made it, Daniel P. Moynihan, supplied the measure of our success: it is the Harvard men, he remarked, who are to be checked for security clearance and it is the Fordham graduates who do the checking.

Parousia Now

That Daniel Berrigan's example and charismatic personality have strongly stimulated among younger Jesuits the conviction that Christianity has a social message and that they are involved in its meaning for the world, seems certain. As one who edited *Social Order*, a monthly review with precisely that scope and function and which died for lack of Jesuit support, I note the change with satisfaction. To be

sure, I am often disconcerted by some manifestations of that enthusiasm: the ease with which gospel truths are translated into concrete political programmes, the astonishment that the problem of evil is intractable to foot-stomping, the solipsism of solution by incantation, the exuberance of the demand for "Parousia Now". Father Berrigan is not wholly innocent of such tendencies himself, as when he wishes the Society of Jesus to be "a brotherhood which will be skilled in a simple, all but lost art — the reading of the gospel and life according to its faith". Would that reordering society and righting a wounded world were as simple as Prince Kropotkin and the Moral Rearmiers believed and believe. What, for instance, of the future of the Vietnamese who sided with us in the war?

In a letter, widely reprinted, addressed "Dear Father General, Father Provincial and Brothers in Christ", Daniel Berrigan, S.J. explained anew his purposes, announced his continuing resistance to "the instruments of the war makers" and sent "a word of love to the brethren who have been for these 30 years my blood line, my family, my embodied tradition and conscience". It is an eloquent appeal for moral change, for a birth in the spirit requiring "a new acceptance of the world with all that implied: moral crisis, infamy, risk, obloquy, mistakes, *horror vacui*, misunderstanding, the ability to deal with personal and social violence, the breakup of cherished hope, the tearing apart of even the most admirable cultural fabric, the loss of all things, in fact, 'if only Christ be gained' ". The language is redolent of the exigencies of the Eleventh Rule of the Summary of the Constitutions of the Society of Jesus inculcating a search for suffering in imitation of the suffering Christ.

Daniel Berrigan's loyalty to the ideals of the Society, then, is deep and fixed. He is undisturbed about those who leave, identifying himself with the core of *la Compagnie* the "community in which men may speak the truth to men, in which our lives will be purified of the inhuman drives of egoism, acculturation, professional pride and dread of life".

Moreover, he knows the incessant demands of permanent availability in such a career of service. "Being a celibate in this situation", he told an interviewer, "is very important. American society has sexualised itself as a ticket of admission".

And so Daniel Berrigan's "cry for justice and peace" is muted behind the walls of the federal medium security prison at Danbury where he is kept busy killing time and praying for the world. It is overzealous and exaggerated it seems to me, to compare his lot to that of Edmund Campion, S.J. and Alfred Delp, S.J. Queen Elizabeth's executioner hung and butchered the English Jesuit at Tyburn, Hitler's minions garroted the German Jesuit and hung his body on a meat-hook in a toolshed in Plotgensee prison, Berlin. Daniel Berrigan faces the tedium of enforced idleness, the frustration of seclusion and the personal satisfaction of a slowly growing general revulsion over what he thinks of as the murderous misadventure in Vietnam. To the extent that his efforts sharpened the public conscience on the futility of uncontrolled violence, his burden is lightened. The burden on the Jesuit writer of this article, on the other hand, is clear and specified by Daniel Berrigan in his letter to his fellow members of the Society: "I ask your prayers that my brother and I and all who are at the edge may be found faithful and obedient, in good humour, and always at your side".

Oremus pro invicem, Daniele.

"That Hope That is in You"

FRANCIS FENN, S.J.

THE Vatican Council, in speaking of dialogue with our non-Catholic brethren, said that

"It is, of course, essential that doctrine be clearly presented in its entirety. Nothing is so foreign to the spirit of ecumenism as a false conciliatory approach which harms the purity of Catholic doctrine and obscures its assured genuine meaning".

At the same time, theologians (and this applies to all of us in our own degree) need to explain Catholic belief "in ways and in terminology which our separated brethren can really understand", and to remember that

"in Catholic teaching there exists an order or *hierarchy* of truths, since they vary in their relationship to the foundation of the Christian faith". ⁽¹⁾

This does not mean that, for instance, the infallibility of the Pope is "less true" than the incarnation of the Son of God: the relationship, however, of these two truths to "the foundation of the Christian faith" is different.

One may put the matter somewhat more practically. An unbeliever asks you why you are a Christian, what you believe. "Always be prepared to make a defence to anyone who calls you to account for the hope that is in you, yet do it with gentleness and reverence". ⁽²⁾ Circumstances were different in St. Peter's day: the Christians to whom he wrote were under persecution. Yet his words apply to us. What is the "foundation of the Christian faith"? Can you account for "the hope that is in you"?

I think it important that St. Peter speaks of the *hope* that is ours, rather than the *faith*. I shall return to this later. But if someone asks you about your belief, you are clearly not going to start by talking, for example, about Our Lady. What are you going to start with? Perhaps it is not so much

(1) *Decree on Ecumenism*, art. II. (2) I Peter 3,15

of a problem — our difficulty is rather to put the matter into words. After all, it is not a question of *what* we believe (as if our task was to pick out one or two from a set of truths or propositions such as are contained in the Creed). It is a question, basically, of our belief (and our hope) in a *person* — namely Jesus Christ. The Christian message is Jesus Christ himself: he is “the foundation of the Christian faith”. All that we believe as Catholic Christians has to do with his Person, his teaching, the work that he came to do, its continuing results and its final outcome.

Our statement of the gist of the Christian message to the modern unbeliever must be in terms that answer his human need: it must, in present-day jargon, be relevant. It is not enough to repeat a traditional formula of faith, and then to adopt a take-it-or-leave-it attitude. This was presumably in the mind of a theologian at the congress held at Brussels last September ⁽³⁾ when he proposed this summary:

“In the light and power of Jesus we are able, in the world to-day, to live, to act, to suffer and to die in a truly human way, because totally dependent on God and totally committed to our fellow human beings.” ⁽⁴⁾

Whatever you think of that as a statement of “the Christian message for today”, it would not be much use in conversation with your unbelieving friend. As it stands, it is of course much too “potted”. And your friend would expect your statement to be a personal one: what your religion means to *you*. This must be evident, at least, from the way in which you give the message.

So much depends on who your friend is, his cast of mind, his general education and so on. Does he know anything about Jesus Christ? If not, or if he knows very little, you may be able to persuade him to read one of the gospels (Mark is the shortest). Making a “statement” here and now may not be the way to proceed. One way would be to persuade him (or her) to come with you to Mass, and then ask questions afterwards.

(3) Cf. CHRISTIAN ORDER, November, 1970.

(4) quoted in *The Month*, Nov. 1970, p. 134.

I make this somewhat obvious suggestion for a reason. Our faith cannot be properly understood apart from the community of the faithful, the Church, in which it has been handed down and developed and in which it lives; and the community is most fully itself when it is gathered together for the Eucharist. "A Christian confession of faith acquires its full meaning, is explained and filled out, only in the context of the Christian liturgy." (5)

It was the intention of the Vatican Council that the prayers and ceremonies of the Mass should "express more clearly the holy things which they signify" and that people "should be able to understand them with ease . . . they normally should not require much explanation." (6) No doubt this refers chiefly to the Catholic faithful, but the power of the Mass to evangelise should not be underestimated. This will only be true when priest and people carry out their parts with dignity and clarity — the new Order of Mass depends a great deal on its participants. One would have to choose the particular Mass to which to take an unbeliever.

What he will ask questions about afterwards I cannot of course predict, but even Catholics have commented on a new emphasis in the present Mass which may well strike an unbeliever too. Thus, for example:

" . . . protect us from all anxiety as we wait in joyful hope for the coming of our Saviour, Jesus Christ" in the extension of the Lord's Prayer. The same theme occurs in two of the new eucharistic prayers and in three of the "acclamations" after the consecration. (The words *mysterium fidei*, now translated "let us proclaim the mystery of faith", were removed from the consecration of the chalice. It is not clear how they got there in the first place, unless they were an acclamation — "the mystery of faith!" If so, they are clearly much better placed as they are at present.)

It is right that we should proclaim Christ's presence among us at this point of the Mass. "The mystery", to quote St. Paul, "is Christ among you, your hope of glory" (7):

(5) *ibid.*, p. 135.

(6) *Constitution on the Liturgy*, 21 & 34.

(7) Colossians 1,27.

Christ who died, is risen, will come again. We proclaim this mystery not only to God (in thanksgiving) and to one another and any unbeliever who may happen to be present: we have to proclaim it above all in our lives. Dying with Christ to our own self-centredness; living with the power of Christ risen from the dead; looking forward to his final triumph, and our own and our neighbour's share in it — "your hope of glory". Implied in this is the resurrection of the body to which we profess to "look forward" in the Creed. Christ is spoken of by St. Paul as "the first fruits of those who have fallen asleep" (8); and

"if the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you, he who raised Jesus from the dead will give life to your mortal bodies also, through his Spirit who dwells in you". (9)

It is the Holy Spirit active in men's lives who is the sign and pledge of the kingly power of the risen Christ:

"All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me . . . and know that I am with you always; yes, to the end of time." (10)

This authority (which he has as man) and his presence in the world, is hidden. But at the close of human history it will be revealed: "when Christ who is our life appears, then you also will appear in glory with him." (11) Or, as the letter to the Hebrews puts it:

"He has made his appearance once and for all to do away with sin by sacrificing himself . . . when he appears a second time, it will be to reward with salvation those who are waiting for him". (12)

The English word "second" is perhaps a little misleading, as it might be taken to mean that what has happened "once and for all" is to be repeated. His coming at Christmas is celebrated as something full of promise — but this promise will only be fulfilled when he "comes again" to show the final victory of God. Of this, Christ's own resurrection is the foreglow and assurance. "Coming on the clouds of heaven" is an image used to suggest God's power and glory

(8) I Corinthians 15,20.

(9) Romans 8,11 (10) Matt. 28:18,20 (11) Col. 3,4 (12) Heb. 9:26,28.

which will then be revealed: Christ has not in fact gone away to another *place*.

Your unbelieving friend may think of a glorious future for mankind — but brought about by man's own conquests. By himself, the Christian will say, man remains man (as we know to our cost) — whatever his earthly achievements. It is God in Christ who brings real salvation and fulfilment, already assured but not as yet complete. The "second coming" cannot therefore be looked upon simply as the conclusion of a process of history:

"It is not that time brings his Day, and it is not that history proves him right; but he guides time to his Day. The return of Christ does not come of itself, like the year 1971, but comes from himself, when and as God wills, according to his promise." (13)

Meanwhile we hope for this fulfilment and it is right for us to pray for it: "Come, Lord Jesus!" (14)

(13) J. Moltman: *The Theology of Hope*, p. 193 (14) Revelations 22,20.

FOREIGN 'AID'

"The biggest single misconception about the foreign aid programme is that we send money abroad. We don't. Foreign aid consists of American equipment, raw materials, expert services and food — all provided for specific development projects which we ourselves review and approve . . . Ninety-three per cent of AID funds are spent directly in the U.S. to pay for these things. Just last year some 4,000 American firms in 50 states received \$1.3 billion in AID funds for products supplied as part of the foreign aid programme" (William S. Gaud, quoted in *The Challenge of World Poverty*, by Gunnar Myrdal, Allen Lane, 1970, p. 355).

In this article E. L. Way glances at some of the vital statistics of Latin America, sketches the make-up of the governments of the Andean bloc, outlines the Brazilian 'Operation Cage', and looks at some predictions for the future.

Latin American Samba

E. L. WAY

A BUSINESSMAN in Switzerland received a letter from his brother in Brazil congratulating him on his 54th birthday. Life in Rio, the brother wrote, was 'pleasant and uneventful'; and one day, he predicted, Brazil would be one of the 'stablest nations of Latin America'. Very shortly after reading the letter, Rudi Bucher, was informed that his brother had been kidnapped by guerrillas in Rio. The kidnapped man, the writer of the letter, was Switzerland's ambassador in Brazil: Giovanni Enrico Bucher. The man on the spot always knows best. *Our Man in Havana*, or in Washington, probably knows more about vacuum cleaners or banks than he knows about the people in the factories or the ghettos in either country. But those who make the appointments continue to have faith in their own kind of people.

And this introductory cautionary tale is by way of a hint to the reader that a waltz or rather a samba around Latin America in my company is not without its dangers of mistake and misrepresentation. However, the drawing of a vacuum cleaner will not be passed off as a plan of a large concrete platform: part of a big military installation under construction in the mountains in some remote province.

Population Figures

Latin America has 24 independent nations with a total population of 290 million which is increasing at the rate of

3 per cent a year. This increase represents 700 additional babies every hour. And if expectant mothers, of their 10th or 12th child, are asked how they will keep the baby alive when the father is unskilled and jobless, the question is not understood. The more children they have the more security will be theirs when they are old and helpless. There isn't much money around, and they hope that their children will look after them when they can work no longer. It is the outlook of all communities, from Chile to Calcutta, wherever people stand on their own feet, have no social conscience, and are completely unconcerned about their neighbours. The 'lame ducks': illiterates, unskilled, jobless and crippled hurriedly crowd into a slum area called a *callampa* in Chile, a *barriada* in Lima, a *favela* in Rio, and a *villa miseria* in Argentina. And there they fester.

If the present rate of increase of the population continues through the 1970s, '80s and into the '90s there will be 600 million Latin Americans.

Birth control is opposed by the Church and by a number of Latin American leaders. The military President of Brazil, Gen. Emílio Garrastozú Médici, denounces birth control as 'the work of American imperialists'. "We have plenty of unused land", he says, "and we need more people to populate it." (Brazil has about 100 million people.) In Mexico (population 50 million) the President, Luis Echeverría Álvarez, has also opposed strongly the use of birth control. At the present rate of increase, 3.39 per cent, Mexico within twenty years will have a population of 100 million. Mexico city itself grows by 350,000 every year. Its present population is 8 million.

Urban Development

Latin America is more urbanised than Europe. Slightly more than half the population live in cities. In 1920 only 12 per cent lived in cities; in 1970 this percentage had risen to 50. In the next 15 years city dwellers will increase by 100 million. Very large numbers of these city dwellers in Rio, Sao Paulo, Mexico City, Buenos Aires, Santiago, Bogotá

and in Lima live in conditions which cannot be accepted by any standard. (The Organisation of American States — O.A.S. — estimates that fully half the population of the cities live under subsistence conditions, and that the position is worsening.) Latin American nations in order to cope with this situation must build 1 million dwellings in the cities annually for the next five years. Less than 2 houses a year per 1,000 inhabitants are built at the present time.

Keeping the people out of the cities seems to be impossible. Spengler foretold the rise (and fall) of the world city long ago: "Homesickness for the great city is keener than any nostalgia. Home is for him any of these giant cities but even the nearest village is alien territory. He would sooner die upon the pavements than go back to the land". "At least in the city", they say, "there is hope". Even with improvements in the countryside the labour force dwindles. According to the report of the Agriculture Department (in the USA) the farm-labour force which in October 1970 numbered 4,991,000 workers had shrunk by 3 per cent from a year earlier.

Leftist Governments

On 7 October 1970 Gen. Juan José Torres seized power in Bolivia. The country is in serious economic trouble. The price of tin on the world markets has been going down, and Bolivia depends on tin for its foreign exchange earnings. Workers and students are demanding better economic conditions, with increases in pay and a greater control of industry by the workers. In swift reaction much of the eloquence about revolution at the time of the takeover has been toned down. But the President has not dropped his self-imposed title of 'the President of the workers'.

In Chile, for the first time in the western world, a Marxist was elected by democratic methods to lead a nation. Within its first 100 days of office the stage was set for the establishment of a controlled economy. In his policy statement Dr. Allende promised to

- Honour Chile's external debts
- Nationalise US copper interests in Chile; and nationalise all banks and insurance companies
- Expand agrarian reform which would end "centuries-old latifundismo" in the country
- Expropriate cement and textile industries and other means of production so "that key industrial monopolies should be in the hands of the state".

Dr. Allende's go-slow policy has calmed the panic among US investors in Chile (the holdings amount to nearly \$1 billion). But even if he seized the investments many American firms would fall back on the political risk insurance programmes administered by AID (Agency for International Development) which guarantees some \$390 millions of U.S. investments in Chile. (There are available to each Latin American 24 grams of animal protein per day compared with 66 grams in North America — *Third World Food Survey* — and it should not be forgotten that much of the economic life of Latin America "is dominated by foreign business, mostly American. Directly or indirectly, through joint enterprises and other arrangements, United States corporations now control or decisively influence between 70 and 90 per cent of the raw material resources of Latin America, and probably much more than half of its modern manufacturing industry, banking, commerce, and foreign trade, as well as much of its public utilities" — *The Challenge of World Poverty*, by Gunnar Myrdal, p. 455, Allen Lane, 1970).

In Peru in October 1968 Maj. Gen. Juan Velasco Alvarado and his army friends by a *coup* took over the government 'to save the nation from chaos'. They set up a school where military tactics are taught along with Marxist theory, social planning, economics, and reformist politics. The training is taken with great seriousness. A wide-ranging programme of social and economic reform has begun, changes have been made in the banking system, agrarian reform has been carried through, and the International Petroleum Company (a subsidiary of Standard Oil of New Jersey) has been expropriated.

Thus three Andean states have nationalist governments promising, and in two cases bringing about revolutionary changes. And efforts at economic integration will most likely proceed at regional level successfully throughout South America as in the bloc: Peru, Bolivia, and Chile. These countries have been joined by Ecuador and Colombia, both favouring much more co-operation with the US. The 1970s are likely to see the end of the isolation of Cuba.

In the '60s there were about 60 changes of government in the 24 nations of Latin America. There was one war, one major US sponsored invasion attempt, one civil war, 21 military coups and 18 border disputes. A record which no one wants to see repeated in the next decade. Odd as it may seem to some, the islands in the Caribbean: Barbados, Tobago, Trinidad and Jamaica now regard themselves as Latin American. And to these will be joined the French- and Spanish-speaking islands.

'Operation Cage'

The Brazilians as we all know are the world's greatest footballers. And until November last it was still possible to believe that with a 7 per cent growth rate, a 30 per cent increase in exports, and foreign reserves going beyond the \$1 billion mark all was set fair for that happy land to become one day a democracy 'with free universities, free unions, a free press and a free church'. And then Operation Cage (code name) was mounted: police and security forces launched a reign of terror. Roadblocks held up the traffic on all the chief highways. Airports and railway stations were under guard; helicopters racketed above the main cities; and everyone was warned to have their papers ready. Arrests were numerous and included any and everybody: politicians, maids, nuns, clerks, journalists, musicians and housewives. In Rio and Sao Paulo it was estimated that as many as 10,000 had been carted off to jail. Union leaders and students were left alone. The large number arrested is said to have shocked the President, 64-year-old Gen. Emílio Garrastazú Médici. The rest of the world was not so shocked

as it had been hearing about terror squads and torture in Brazil since the beginning of 1970.

Predictions

Gunnar Myrdal asks the question: will there be a mass revolt, and has it a chance of succeeding? And answers:

"The glorification of violence, now becoming so popular in leftist writing on the Latin American situation, assumes that the answer to both these questions is in the affirmative . . . On these two points I diverge. The masses are initially too passive. Even more important is the fact that every attempt to activate them will at the start meet overwhelming military and police power, supported by the indigenous oligarchy — and by the United States, which believes that it has learned a lesson from the Cuban experience.

"I see little chance for any large-scale, successful revolt against the present economic, social, and political power structure in Latin American countries. The exceptions would be the perhaps not very likely possibility of a military government cutting its ties to both the indigenous oligarchy and the American corporations — and soon the American government — and arousing the masses in its support. *But such a revolt, led by a military government itself, would not need to use too much violence*" (ibid. pp 484-85). The part of the prediction which suggests a military government cutting itself adrift from American big business and the indigenous oligarchy we can see has been partly fulfilled since Myrdal's book was published.

Much will depend on the Americans. Are there many who still believe that Fascism is the only defence against Communism? Do we want Hitlers defending us against bolshevism? Does any one want another, and this time successful, McCarthy chasing all the liberals out of America? Clearly the Latin Americans will not passively fester for much longer in their shanty towns. There may not be large-scale successful revolt but already squatters have seized 4,250 new apartments in Santiago alone; wildcat strikes, and demonstrations by workers and students in Chile show that the speed of revolutionary change is accelerating.

CURRENT COMMENT

In this article, Father Crane notes with concern the assumption of a bogus sovereignty that lies behind contemporary student demands. Students who demand most stridently are, as a rule, quite lacking in the sense of responsibility necessary to implement their demands, even if legitimate. The same is true, to no small extent, at the fringe of contemporary religious life in this and other countries. The claims of dignity are falsely identified with those of sovereignty. As a result, authority is at a discount within religious orders today and threatened by a bogus democracy. Things will only come right with the restoration of true authority.

Student World and Religious Life

THE EDITOR

I FOUND somewhat nauseating the spectacle presented in the Press some weeks ago of the would-be head of the combined Polytechnic of North London seeking to defend himself before the student body against the charge that, whilst Principal of the University College of Rhodesia, he had favoured unduly the Smith regime.

Trial by Student Court

What amazes me is that Professor Terence Miller — or, for that matter, anyone in a similar position — should have consented thus to be vetted by the student body before

assuming his appointment. So to do is to consent to the altogether false principle that sovereignty resides in the student body and may be exercised, as occasion demands, by overriding the decisions of those who are in legitimate authority over it. To say this is not, of course, to deny for a moment that a mature student body can lay fair claim through responsibly chosen representatives to be associated with decisions made in its regard by the educational authority that has charge of it. It has to be recognised at the same time, however, that association of the sort offered nowadays by higher educational authorities in this country presumes a marked degree of student responsibility. Ironically enough, it is precisely the absence of this which is noteworthy in contemporary student bodies and revealed every time they call for mass action in support of demands recognised at once as irresponsible and immature because backed in this precipitate and ill-mannered fashion. From which, I think, one is entitled to conclude that what students in contemporary Britain are after is not a sharing of responsibility with those whose decisions affect their lives, but a species of rule by soviet — power made manifest and effective through threat of force. Thus, with Professor Miller and the students of North London Polytechnic. Having been forced to present himself before them as to a kind of People's Court, the decision was taken by show of hands and the majority verdict published that, unless the Polytechnic's Education Authority reconsidered its appointment within twenty-eight days, the (sovereign) student body would take over the North London Polytechnic by sit-in. This, of course, is akin to blackmail of the sort made manifest through the protection racket; pay up or we will break up what you have.

Laziness and Malice

Underlying this sort of irresponsible practice — which is common now in what used to be called centres of learning and almost the rule in the trade-union world — is an enormous laziness. It is this that I find particularly repulsive in the student fringe which screams out its demands so

stridently in the name of a fake democracy in Britain today. Face the members of this fringe with the hard work endemic in sharing with legitimate authority responsibility for their academic lives; face them with the harsh reality of this process and they will run away from it. The last thing they want in fact is the self-denial that goes with the responsibility they profess to crave for. What they want in fact is not responsibility but notice and that is what children want — to have their cake and eat it, the glory without the pain, the prize without the effort. Mummy give me a sweet or I'll scream. It is like that in the student world; easier and far more attractive — especially when a sychophantic Press and TV are there to add bogus lustre to your cause — to get what you want by shouting down weak-kneed authority than to work out with it, responsibly and in relative obscurity, the significance of legitimate student claims. There are very few volunteers for this sort of work in today's universities and polytechnics. When it comes to a riot, however, or trying a prospective staff-member by People's Court, the crowd is always there to give mindless assent to so-called student leaders whose preoccupation is more with their image than the validity of their demands.

Dignity and Authority

One notes with sadness but without surprise that this same sort of attitude in penetrating sectors of religious life in this and other countries. Within some religious communities, indeed, rule from the floor is thought by some extraordinary misunderstanding to own its origin to the second Vatican Council. How this most extraordinary conclusion has been arrived at I do not know; and I would certainly defy anyone to show me chapter and verse in the council documents in support of this peculiar contention. What has risen, in fact, within religious life is a misunderstanding of the relationship which should exist between the claims of human dignity and those of authority. The misunderstanding is worth investigating and a beginning can best be made with the reflection that the dignity of the

human person governs the *manner* in which authority should be exercised, but *in no way* removes the need for its employment or, indeed, existence. Let me explain.

Obedience as Shared Responsibility

Man's dignity is found in his special likeness to God. The likeness itself is in his soul and the ways of acting which flow from its powers of understanding and will are those which are essentially his as a human being. Because he is what he is man stands defined as a person meant to take responsible charge of his own life under God. It is as such that he must be regarded by those in authority over him, whether he be a religious or in the lay state. This does not remove the need for authority: what it does is to lay on those in authority over men the obligation of treating them for what by nature they are, responsible human beings because made in the image of God. What this means in practice is that commands given to human beings in religious life should be transmitted to them in courteous fashion and through their understanding; seeking, thereby, to associate them positively and responsibly with the order that has been made. The ideal is that which sees the execution of a command as a shared responsibility between superior and subject. It makes heavy demands on both. From the side of authority it calls for understanding, patience and the kind of knowledge that comes from close study of the area within which the command of the superior will be set: that there have been many failures here in the past — and, as a consequence, many lives in religion broken through frustration—no one in his senses will deny. From the side of the subject, the ideal which sees the exercise of authority as a shared responsibility calls for the kind of responsible application that leads to careful and devoted exploration of the ground within which orders are likely to be set and an ascetic schooling of the will to the point where the command of authority is regarded with true objectivity as coming from one who holds his power from God. Co-operation of this sort between superior and sub-

ject is, of course, impossible without prayer. Once established, it should make of the giving and carrying out of a command what it always should be—a matter of shared responsibility between superior and subject, which is itself an expression of the unity in Christ that ties both together in the pursuit of an ideal geared to the glory of God. There is little need to stress here that the concept of a command as a shared responsibility lays on superior and subject a heavy burden of work and prayer to enlighten the understanding and discipline the will of each in their pursuit of God's glory. It presumes also that those in the formative stages of religious life will not share with a superior responsibility for a command to the same degree as those who have long since left their formative days behind them. The appropriate exercise of responsibility presumes a degree of maturity which, in the very nature of things, is not to be found amongst those in the first stages of religious life. It is of its nature that it should be developed and this can only be through prayer and hard work. Sadly enough, it is difficult to find any strong inclination for either amongst many young religious today: at the same time, these are most resentful of legitimate authority, most strident in their demands for control of their own lives. The parallel with the student world is almost complete.

Authority and Sovereignty

It is a far cry, indeed, from the concept which leaves authority intact as God-given whilst seeing the manner of its exercise as defined by human dignity, to the attitude prevalent at present amongst certain young (and not so young) priests and religious, which calls for the virtual abolition of authority in face of dignity's supposed claims. These are identified falsely with those of sovereignty, which I once heard the late Harold Laski describe as the ability to give orders to all and take them from none. Dignity, in other words, is confused with autonomy and thought of as conferring on the subject an independence of action, which renders authority virtually obsolete or, at

best, dependent for its valid exercise on the assent of the subject. This point of view is wholly false and the confusion which supports it based on wrong thinking. I have described it above as lying between dignity and sovereignty. Man's right to make something of his life under God is interpreted quite arbitrarily and falsely as his supposed right to do so without reference to authority which owes its existence ultimately to his total dependence on God. Human fulfilment, which each man's dignity demands, is seen in consequence and however subconsciously as a process wholly within the control of the subject in this false sense, that authority is there merely to give formal ratification to decisions taken by the subject in his own regard and certain to be good because directed by himself in the interests of his own human fulfilment. This view takes little conscious count of man's total dependence on God by whom he was made from nothing and to whom he owes all. It forgets that man's human soul, which gives him his dignity and defines, indeed, his *manner* of acting, makes him wholly dependent on God and subject, therefore, to those who hold authority under God. Independence of action, therefore, is ruled out in man's regard as alien to his nature in its total dependence on God. Dignity, in consequence, does not confer sovereignty. It does not abolish authority; no more does it ground it in the subject. What it does do is define the manner of its exercise, seeing the command of obedience as a shared responsibility held under God.

Anarchy and Rule by Soviet

Ironically enough, as already noted, priests and religious today, who see dignity as endowing them with autonomy, are lacking as a rule in that elementary sense of responsibility which must be had if they are to co-operate, as dignity demands, with those who exercise authority over them. In this they are so like the contemporary student fringe with its strident demands for participation, whilst without the will to acquire, through hard work and experience, the wisdom out of which will come that mature sense of responsibility

which is essential if the participation they call for is to become in any way effective. Which makes one wonder, once again, whether what they really want is responsible participation or merely self-assertion of a somewhat childish sort. Responsible participation, surely, should be given only to those who work and pray to fit themselves for it. Superiors who fail to see this, who bow before irresponsible demands of their subjects made in the interests of a bogus fulfilment, must take a large share of the blame for turning religious life into what it has tended recently to become in the case of some communities, an unpleasant mixture of anarchy and rule by local soviet, devoid of that strong unity in Christ which should mark the lives of religious men and women.

Democracy no Substitute for Religious Unity

At this point, it is perhaps worth noting that the introduction into a religious order or community of the democratic apparatus is in no sense a substitute for that unity in the pursuit of a spiritual ideal which should mark the lives of its members. This can be maintained and, indeed, strengthened only through the generous assumption of increased responsibility as wisdom is gained through experience tempered, as it must be, by sacrifice and prayer. The structure of religious life is, therefore, hierarchical; quite alien from that which rests on a process of counting heads, thinking, it would seem, to find wisdom in numbers and truth in majority decision. It favours participation indeed, but not through the mechanics of the vote, for this way it can be brainlessly given as secular experience shows; and the life of a religious order will disintegrate if consigned to the rainless and the immature, who can destroy in no time the heritage of hundreds of years, as some have had to learn sadly since the second Vatican Council. No, the only kind of participation valid for the members of a religious order is that which comes through closer association with its life on a basis of increased responsibility. Religious men and women play a more responsible part in the affairs of their orders as maturity is achieved through experience, self-sacrifice and

prayer. There is room for all in this process, but participation is never accorded equally and mechanically to all. It is essentially something that has to be earned; a responsibility accorded to religious not mechanically, but in accordance with their fitness for it, which is measured, as a rule, by what I have described as their maturity.

The Craving for Sameness

This view in no way coincides with the wishes of progressive members of religious orders today. So far as I can see, these have been beset during recent years by an egalitarian craving differing only in kind from that made manifest within the fringe segments of society at large and particularly, perhaps, in the student world: here, the passion for sameness makes itself manifest in an identity of dress and mores found within *outré* student groups. Within such circles conformity is all in order that sameness may be achieved and, with it, the foundations of a new society where tears and suffering will be washed away as differences of class and race are disposed of in order that eventually a new heaven may be built on a new earth. The dream is as old as man. I do not despise it. I get bored nevertheless with the naivete that sets off from time to time, to say nothing of the laziness that favours instant utopia mainly, it would appear, on the off-chance that it can be had without tears. The counterpart in religious life of this student-craving for sameness finds expression not only in the contrived equality of the Mechanical vote, which progressives would accord to each member of their order without reference to the measure of his responsibility, but in a host of other ways. One that immediately comes to mind is the assumption of lay dress, which is adopted not to make themselves more available as religious, but to disguise the fact that they are religious and satisfy, thereby, their craving to be the same as other men, which they represent as a desire for involvement with mankind; not, if I may put it brutally, that they may help mankind the better to carry its burden, but simply that they themselves may feel the same as other men. There is, I fear, no merit in this;

little more than a yielding to selfishness, which is proved by the fact that priests and religious who adopt the dress and manners of the world do so, as a rule, without consideration for the great body of the Faithful who are very often scandalised and hurt by their conduct. As one would expect, their retort to those who query their attire is that they are dragging the Church out of its bourgeois stuffiness and bringing it into the world of men. This is, in fact, not true: in support, one need only look at the lay attire adopted by most young religious. It is designed not to identify them — even if this were desirable — and, through them, the Church with the world of men; but to project themselves into the contrived classlessness of society's permissive fringe. It is here that they feel at home, in a self-consciously egalitarian world without differences, without distinction and without manners; and it is this kind of world which they would like to impose on the religious orders and congregations of which they are members, thinking, no doubt and in their ignorance, that it represents the wave of the future and that, unless its habits and outlook are adopted now, their particular religious order or congregation will suffer the most frightful fate conceivable, which is to be the odd man out. They forget, again in their ignorance, that this precisely is what Christ was.

Quality, Prayer and Vocation

It should cause no surprise that the present pursuit of egalitarianism within religious orders and congregations could coincide with a marked falling off in the habit of prayer amongst men and women religious. Where God is loved and unity sought in him, individual differences and its soon cease to matter. What counts is life shared with him. Under such circumstances, the substance of things is here and the structure of religious life effortlessly hierarchial. What counts is unity in God's love, a sharing in the pursuit of a great ideal. The rest, in a sense, is irrelevant. It ceases to be when the love of God grows cold, prayer becomes a duty and life is viewed in increasingly natural terms. Under

such circumstances the substance of religious life begins to go and, as it does, accidentals assume a false importance. There is talk then of the structure of religious life and of democratic representation; of tuning in to the world and being with it; of the need for instant change. Those who have observed the restless disunity, which takes over as prayer goes from a religious community will know exactly what I mean. As the substance of religious life is lost, the accidentals loom large. It is under these circumstances that the equalitarians move in.

Restoration of True Authority

Most unfortunately, they have been listened to far too often in recent years by frightened superiors, who have found no way of dealing with their pushful arrogance. The result has been increased confusion, to put it mildly, and the kind of downgrading that comes to religious life when it is beset by internal dispute, with the progressives in charge of the corridors of power; at home in a situation where what is called the "restructuring" of religious life has replaced an ordered hierarchical existence with the feuding of somewhat rootless sectional interests. Small wonder, in consequence, that vocations have fallen to a minimum. They will remain at a minimum until religious life recovers its religious ideals. A first condition of its doing so is that true authority should be restored to it — and the spectre of popular sovereignty banished from its midst forever.

In the last few years, the International Office has been drawing a crowd of 3,000 to its Annual Congress at the Palais de Beaulieu, Lausanne, Switzerland. Of those attending, 45 per cent are under 25 years of age and a very high proportion of the remainder under 30. The President is Jean Ousset. In this article, Hamish Fraser, a regular participant at Lausanne and Editor of *Approaches*, which promotes the International Office in the United Kingdom, tells readers what it is and does. This article first appeared in *Immaculata* magazine in the United States. It is republished by permission of its Author and with gratitude to the Editor of *Immaculata*.

The International Office

HAMISH FRASER

IF there is one outstanding message that Vatican II has for the contemporary world it is that the renewal of the temporal order is the task of the laity. This is a task which *only* the laity can accomplish. This is a task which the laity cannot possibly delegate to the clergy — not even partially.

This is a task which cannot be accomplished under clerical leadership. Clerical leadership *in this sphere* — i.e. in the sphere of social, civic and political activities — would involve and thereby tend to compromise the institutional Church politically. And this, of course, is quite out of the question. For were the Church to allow herself to be thus compromised this would completely misrepresent the Church's true relationship to human society and interfere with the Hierarchy's own essentially spiritual apostolate.

Render unto Caesar

The Church has never sought to establish a theocracy. The Church has consistently rendered unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's. The Church has never sought to govern human society. The Church has always respected the legitimate autonomy of the temporal order. It always has been and is the laity's role to act as a leavening and governing influence within the various spheres of society.

But this means that the laity must face up to their responsibilities in this respect by means of initiatives that are *juridically independent* of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. In short, in this sphere, lay people are on their own and must be seen to be on their own. They must, in this sphere, be under lay, not clerical leadership.

This does not mean, however, that layfolk can do as they please, or make their own whatever worldly social or political philosophy seems likely to have the greater mass appeal. Nor can Catholic layfolk seriously pretend that there is any need to shop around for ideological enlightenment. For as Pope John has assured us in *Mater et Magistra*: in the course of the last hundred years the Church "has propounded a social doctrine which points out with clarity the sure way to social reconstruction". And as he adds: "this Catholic social doctrine is an integral part of the Christian conception of life".

Fidelity to Vatican II therefore implies two things:

(1) uncompromising obedience to the social doctrine of the Magisterium.

(2) the effective implementation of the Church's social doctrine by action that is *juridically independent* of the Hierarchy.

In other words, what Vatican II is calling for is nothing less than the restoration of the temporal power of the loyal Christian laity: the only means whereby society can be induced to accept the social Kingship of Our Divine Lord.

The Social "Action of Catholics"

It goes without saying that the temporal power of the laity cannot be restored by *Catholic Action* types of organisa-

tion, i.e. by organisations under ecclesiastical patronage, organisations which cater to the laity's role as members of the Church's flock, organisations which assist the laity to participate in the spiritual apostolate of the Hierarchy.

When Christian layfolk act in their capacity as members of human society rather than as members of the Church's flock, *this is no longer Catholic Action but the social Action of Catholics.*

But when the layman is acting as a citizen, this does mean that he should necessarily act as an individual. In other words, the Action of Catholics requires to be organised no less than does Catholic Action. For in no sphere of activity can human action be effective when men act simply as individuals. As Pope Leo XIII reminds us in *Rerum Novarum*:

"The consciousness of his own weakness urges man to call in aid from without. We read in the pages of Holy Writ: 'It is better that two should be together than one; for they have the advantage of their society. If one falls he shall be supported by the other. Woe to him that is alone, for when he falleth he hath none to lift him up'. (Eccles. IV, 9/10). And further: 'A brother that is helped by his brother is like a strong city' (Prov. XVIII, 19). It is this natural impulse that binds men together in civil society".

However, an entirely different type of organisation is required for the social Action of Catholics. Where, as the hallmark of Catholic Action types of organisation you have the presence of a chaplain, the symbol (if, alas! by no means always the guarantee) of obedience to the will of the Hierarchy, Action of Catholic type organisations cannot possibly have chaplains. If they had, they would not be juridically independent of the Hierarchy and would be unable to act without compromising the Hierarchy politically. Nor must Action of Catholics type of organisations even call themselves Catholic.

And yet, unless such organisations are informed by a spirit of uncompromising fidelity to the social teaching of the Magisterium, clearly they could not possibly serve any

useful purpose. Thus the first precondition for establishing organisations appropriate to the layman's temporal role within the temporal order is a lay élite so doctrinally formed that, to this élite, infidelity to Catholic social doctrine would be as inconceivably repugnant as is outright heresy, schism or apostasy to the generality of the faithful.

The International Office came into existence in order to promote the emergence of organisations appropriate to the Action of Catholics, i.e. organisations inspired, animated and guided by an élite of lay people who have been thoroughly grounded in the social doctrine of the Church, trained in a spirit of uncompromising fidelity to the Magisterium and able to implement Christian social principles in a practical, common-sense, non-doctrinaire way. It is not for nothing, therefore, that the full title of the Office is, The International Office of Associations for Civic Action and Cultural Formation in accordance with Christian Principles and the Natural Law.

Three Musts

There are three basic requisites which any organisation must have before the International Office will regard it as potentially qualifying for affiliation in any way. These are:

(1) Loyalty to the Pope and the Hierarchy; acceptance (at least implicitly) of the Church's social doctrine.

(2) Adequately active opposition to modern totalitarianism and the Revolution.

(3) A readiness to promote effective action on a basis of diversity, subsidiarity and complementarity of effort, excluding all tendencies to form a unitary and unwieldy mass movement.

The International Office and its complex of affiliated or associated groups is not a tightly structured body (like, for example, the Y.C.W. or the Legion of Mary). It is, rather, a clearing house, a meeting point and a *service station* whose facilities, experience and considerable wisdom are at the disposal of all who are seeking to resist subversion and restore the social Kingship of Our Lord.

Associations affiliated to the Office thus retain their independence (as does the Office itself). These associations range from the classic study-group networks, through trade union, student, agricultural and professional groups, to associations of Independent School Parents and cultural and youth organisations.

Movement First Developed in France

The movement first developed in France after World War II under the inspired guidance of Jean Ousset whose unflinching resolution has made possible its continued existence and development.

The first international Congress under Office auspices was held at Sion, Switzerland in 1964. It was attended by a mere 1,300 Congressists. All subsequent Congresses have been held at the Palais de Beaulieu, Lausanne. And in the last few years the number of Congressists has been around the 3,000 mark. The number of Congressists is not likely to increase, for no more than circa 3,000 can be accommodated at the Palais de Beaulieu, the most suitable Congress centre in Europe. Henceforth, Congresses will become increasingly selective, with preference given to people from key milieu who have given some evidence of fruitful activity.

What this means in practice can be seen from the age pattern of the 1970 Lausanne Congress, when no less than 45 per cent of those attending were under 25 years of age, and a very high proportion of the remainder under 30. The movement is thus essentially orientated towards young people — without however in any way excluding those of more mature judgment. (There never has been a generation gap problem within associations affiliated to the Office.)

The Office Publicly Acclaimed by Cardinal Ottaviani

The phenomenal success and the magnitude of Jean Ousset's achievement was publicly acclaimed by Cardinal Ottaviani, in 1968, when he sent a personal message to the Lausanne Congress. The following is a brief excerpt from Cardinal Ottaviani's message:

"I have for long followed with great interest the development of the work of civic, cultural and doctrinal formation which you have initiated after the end of World War II. Confronted with a world in process of breaking up and collapsing on account of its having ignored the norms of wisdom indicated by God, you resolved to work for the restoration of society, drawing your inspiration from Christian principles and the natural law — realising that 'unless the Lord builds the house, those who build it labour in vain' (Ps 126/1).

"I have followed your progress; I have witnessed the struggles and the trials you have experienced; I have sought to sustain your courage, sometimes vacillating in the midst of the tempest. These trials, these gropings, occasional mistakes perhaps — all this was no doubt necessary as a means of perfecting your initiative and of enabling it to develop internationally where it is solidly established, in order thus to work more effectively for the triumph of Christ, that He may reign 'pour qu'il regne', by the cross: 'regnavit a ligno Deus'.

In effect, twenty years ago, you conceived the noble idea of implanting this reign of Christ the King in this topsy-turvy world of ours, through the true mission that properly belongs to the laity. *Was this not an advance response to the appeal of Vatican II in its decree on the apostolate of the laity?* After recalling that 'the mission of the Church is the diffusion of God's Kingdom throughout the entire world', Vatican II teaches that you, the laity, also must exercise the apostolate, especially by 'penetrating and perfecting the temporal order with the spirit of the gospel' (Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity). Your work is therefore truly in the line of the Church and in complete conformity with its teaching".

Dr. Jackson examines the causes of inflation in the post-war period: excessive demand, higher wages, and the injection of money into the flow of income without the extra goods which could mop it up. 'Neither of the main parties in this country have realised the distinct role that incomes policy should play in the control of inflation.'

1971: A Critical Year

J. M. JACKSON

THERE can be little doubt that 1971 will be a critical year for the British economy. Two problems in particular have to be faced, inflation and industrial relations. The steady rise in prices during the last days of the Labour Government contributed to its downfall. The main cause of this inflationary movement was the irresponsibility of the Labour Government in relaxing its incomes policy in the months preceding the election. For years, it had attempted to hold the rate of increase in wages to something in the order of 3 or 4 per cent a year, roughly in line with the possible rate of increase in productivity. If it never quite succeeded in keeping wages in line with productivity, the rate of increase was kept to something not all that much bigger, and although prices rose they rose relatively slowly. With the approach of the election, the Government decided that its unpopular incomes policy could not be continued if there was to be any prospect of success at the election. As a result, wage increases in the region of 10 per cent became quite usual, an increase that is perhaps three times as much as any annual increase in productivity. With increases of this magnitude, a rapid increase in prices was inevitable.

Nobody who has thought seriously about the subject expected price increases to be brought under control

immediately by the new Government. It would, of course, be possible to introduce legislation which would ban all price increases for the next twelve months. There would be a cost, though. Even if accompanied by a wage freeze, many firms would be forced into bankruptcy. Many firms may already have been involved in wage negotiations which cannot be implemented in the long run without price increases. It could, therefore, be that to impose a price and wages freeze would, in the course of twelve months see an increase in the level of unemployment from a level of something less than 600,000 to nearly a million. A price freeze without a wage freeze could easily create bankruptcies on a scale that would lead to anything up to two million workers being unemployed by the end of the year. A price freeze, therefore, is no way out of the present inflationary situation. Any hope of bringing prices under control must be based on first bringing under control the rate of increase in wages.

So far, the present Government has refused to countenance the return to a statutory incomes policy. Instead, it hopes that negotiators on both sides of industry will return to a more responsible approach to collective bargaining and give heed to the public interest that is involved. It is apparent that the claims being submitted by some unions at the present time are sheer lunacy. Increases of the order of 25 per cent — or even 50 per cent — are so ludicrous that they should be laughed out of court. Is any union leader such a fool as to think that the majority of workers in the country can really be given an increase of a quarter in their pay and enjoy it in real terms? On the other hand, if some groups get away with claims of this magnitude, it is easy to see why others will try to get comparable increases, even if they realise that to succeed will only add fuel to the inflationary spiral. To exercise restraint when you are last in the queue for a wage increase will result in your falling behind in terms of relative income and perhaps even in real terms. Restraint may be in the public interest, but is not in the individual's interest, *at least not unless it is exercised by all*. This is the fatal weakness of relying on voluntary restraint in order to

secure a slowing down of the present rate of increase in wages.

There is a very real danger that if the present rate of inflation continues, the wrong steps will be taken by the Government to try and rectify the situation. Inflation may be the result of one or both of two causes. Over most of the post-war period we have probably suffered from inflation resulting from an excessive level of demand for goods and services. The incomes people receive are just enough to enable them, in aggregate, to buy all the goods and services they have produced, since ultimately every penny paid for these goods and services would go in wages, interest or profits to people who have made some contribution to production, either by their own efforts or by providing the non-human factors of production. So long as people are only spending the incomes they have earned by contributing to production, these incomes will only suffice to purchase current output at the current level of prices. There can be no inflationary pressures. But unfortunately it may not be only current incomes that are creating demand. Our monetary system allows additional funds to be injected into the flow of income. People are able, for example, to overspend their incomes in a period by obtaining goods on hire purchase. Businessmen may be able to finance investment projects by borrowing. If all this borrowing were made possible by other people's savings — if some people could overspend their incomes only because others underspent — there could again be no inflation. But in fact the monetary system allows loans to be made to people without others having made comparable savings. This means that goods of a certain value have been produced, in the process just enough income has been created to purchase this output at current prices, but additional funds are injected into the income flow so that the total money demand for these goods now exceeds their value at current prices. As a result, prices are forced up.* Earnings will tend to rise and employers will often be

* Alternatively, or in addition, the excess demand will be spent on imports to make good the shortfall between home production and demand, thus giving rise to balance of payments difficulties.

ready to offer higher pay to attract workers. Unions may submit wage claims, but these claims may merely be a recognition of the situation that exists. In no real sense are the unions responsible for the inflationary pressure.

The alternative cause of inflation is an upward pressure on costs. Any cost element may be responsible. If, for example, the oil producing countries were to increase regularly the taxes imposed on the export of oil, the oil companies would have to pass these increases on to consumers. The increased cost of oil would lead to other price increases since industries using oil as a fuel or sending goods by road would have to meet this increase in costs. Nevertheless, any impact on the general price level resulting from these higher taxes on oil would be relatively slight. Now consider the case of a wage increase. Wages and salaries now account for something like two-thirds of the national product. So a 10 per cent increase in wages will represent roughly a $6\frac{1}{2}$ per cent increase in costs, unless there is an offsetting increase in productivity. Whilst over most of the post-war period excess demand may have been the more important factor in causing inflation, there has undoubtedly been a strong element of wage-push inflation since sometime before the election.

Remedies that might be appropriate to the control of inflation arising from an excessive level of demand will be quite useless to cope with inflation caused primarily by unreasonable trade union claims for high wages. It might be disastrous for the Government to resort, for example, to the usual measures of credit squeezes and budget surpluses in order to check the present inflation. Monetary policy, with high interest rates and reduced bank lending, forces people to live within their incomes; a budget surplus takes spending power out of people's pockets: thus the two types of policy serve to reduce the level of demand for goods and services. Now consider what happens if these measures are used when inflation is caused by wage increases, but demand is not excessive. Monetary and budgetary policy can still reduce demand, but if demand is not excessive, a reduction will lead

to unemployment. *And there is no guarantee that the pressure for higher wages will not continue.*

Neither of the main parties in this country have realised the distinct role that incomes policy should play in the control of inflation. It should aim at limiting the pressure of trade unions for higher wages, not to limit the general level of demand. The Labour Government imposed a rigid incomes policy at a time when the main pressures towards inflation came from excessive demand — then relaxed the policy so as to allow trade union pressure to force up wage costs when demand had been brought under control. Its timing was all wrong. Now the new Government is taking a doctrinaire stand against any statutory incomes policy when, in fact, this is the only kind of policy that has the slightest hope of controlling the present inflation.

The general state of industrial relations at the present time is far from happy. The proposed legislation on industrial relations is not likely to make any improvements in the short run. Whether any long run benefits are likely is another matter. The best hope, for the present, is that if extravagant wage claims can be resisted and the pace of inflation checked then more realistic claims will be made in the future. Until inflation is brought under control, we may have to accept that resistance to these totally unrealistic wage claims may involve some serious and inconvenient disputes.

As to the proposed legislation, it is quite ridiculous to suggest that this amounts to an attack on the trade unions. The trade unions have for too long enjoyed a position where they have been above the law. They have enjoyed complete immunity from legal proceedings in respect of any wrongful acts committed by them. There is no reason why they should ever have been given an immunity of this kind, still less why they should continue to enjoy it to-day. In certain circumstances, it is necessary that trade unions should be able to call their members out on strike, but this right should be subject to conditions imposed by law. There should be an agreed procedure. Trade unions have no right to negotiate a procedural agreement and at the same time claim legal

immunity from any consequences of breaking that agreement when it suits them. Nor is there any reason why they should not be forced to pay damages to any party injured by their wrongful actions in failing to comply with the agreements they have made — and it should be remembered that the legislation now before Parliament in fact limits the damages that can be awarded by reference to the size of the union. It may well be that legal actions against trade unions will not improve industrial relations — the hope, of course, is that when it comes to the point trade unions will act in a reasonable and law abiding manner. But the argument that this type of legislation will not bring about any improvement in industrial relations is not one that can be legitimately employed by the trade union movement. In so far as they may on occasions act in an improper manner, they have no right to claim exemption from the normal legal consequences of their wrong doing.

It must be emphasised that there is a fundamental difference between the right to strike and the right of the individual worker to withdraw his labour. The individual must always retain the right to leave his employment on giving due notice. A situation where a man cannot do this is one of slavery. For all workers to withdraw their labour — perhaps without notice — and with the intention of retaining the right to their jobs when they have got what they want is another matter. The strike weapon may be justified, but the right to strike is of a radically different order from that of the individual worker to change his job.

A number of issues are raised by recent disputes. In the electricity supply dispute a great deal was made of the increased productivity of the workers. The Court of Inquiry may have reported by the time this article appears, and may have commented on the level of the pay of workers in the electricity supply industry. One thing is certain, however. We must stop once and for all the attempt on the part of workers who happen to have achieved higher productivity to appropriate the lion's share of the benefits resulting from such increased productivity. Because productivity has in-

creased, their services are not necessarily any more valuable to the community than those of workers in essential industries and services where there is no scope for increasing productivity. Other workers will rightly want to get comparable increases, and therefore relating pay to individual increases in productivity is a perfect formula for inflation. Unfortunately, the stupidity of the policy operated by the previous government and the Prices and Incomes Board has created the impression that productivity is *the* argument for exceptional increases in pay.

A second issue raised by the electricity dispute is the right to strike in essential services. The right to strike is not unlimited, and a due balance must be struck between the legitimate claims the workers may have and the needs of the public. The electricity supply workers do not have a right to withdraw their services if this will involve a serious risk to the health and life of other members of the society in which they live. Such a risk undoubtedly existed. Old people living in all electric houses could suffer seriously from cold; or old people with weak hearts were forced to climb stairs to high flats; hospitals had to postpone operations*. One wonders what the electricity workers would say if there were an accident at a power station and they were told that no hospital services were available because the doctors and nurses were on strike over their pay claims!

Of course, the electricity workers were not actually on strike but only 'working to rule'. Legally there is a distinction between 'working to rule' and 'going slow'. The former means a strict adherence to rules laid down by the employers or in agreements between employers and unions. It is a perfectly legitimate procedure, but employers should not be foolish enough to lay down rules that if complied with seriously interfere with the running of the industry. 'Going

* If hospitals were cut off — and often it was impossible to avoid this since whole areas have to be switched off and in London, for example, there were too many areas with hospitals to give them immunity — operations could not take place. Emergency generators might be available, but surgeons regard it as essential to have a standby source of power in case of failure. Only in a serious emergency would they start an operation using the standby equipment.

slow' is a deliberate slowing down of the pace of work — or it could be the introduction of new restrictions by the unions — and would legally be regarded as putting the workers in breach of contract and would give the employers the right to terminate their employment without notice.* The advantage of these methods compared with ordinary strike action is that the workers continue to be paid and so the union does not have to give strike pay. But employers would be fully justified when faced with this kind of action in dismissing workers. There is no reason at all why they should finance the hostile activities of the trade unions.

If the right to strike is limited, then some other means of settling disputes must be found. This is not as easy as it sounds. It cannot be assumed that because unions are sometimes unreasonable, that there are not instances where they may have a sound case. Arbitration may sound attractive, but in fact little guidance is given to arbitrators. The composition of the Court of Inquiry into the electricity dispute illustrates the difficulties. It is perfectly correct that the Court should take account of the public interest as well as the claims of the workers. But different individuals may reach different conclusions on these matters on the basis of the same evidence. If one is cynical, one could say that the Government can get the report it wants by picking the right members for the Court.

There are, then, a great many problems facing the Government in the field of industrial relations. All were foreseeable in the period before the election when the prices and incomes policy was abandoned and the Labour Government let inflation loose rather than risk the unpopularity of continuing with these restraints. And until the inflation is controlled the difficulties will remain. The Industrial Relations Bill can only help (if at all) when this major source of conflict has been removed.

* Dismissal would be for refusing to obey instructions of management to carry on with normal working.

What exactly is meant by permissiveness?
What right has a Catholic minority to
campaign against generally accepted moral
standards? Majority rule is surely a
sound democratic principle. Why such
great efforts, in the name of Ecumenism,
to start a Catholic cult of Luther?

Any Questions?

WILLIAM LAWSON, S.J.

What exactly is meant by permissiveness?

It means the removal of barriers and bounds to human conduct. What was formerly forbidden is now allowed. Desire to do something is justification for doing it.

The causes of permissiveness are many. One of the strongest is the artificiality of modern living which removes the mass of mankind from what is basic and primary, so that the very idea of the natural is remote and vague. Water from the tap or filthy in the rivers, air either "conditioned" or polluted, temperatures controlled by thermostats, mile after mile of pavements and no relief from them except a patch of grass or a garden or a public park — no wonder our urbanised society is losing knowledge of underlying realities. Human nature itself, at the levels of body and mind, can be seemingly changed and made to function outside its former limits. It can be attuned to travel faster than sound for what are now more than commuters' journeys, and it can survive in space-ships and on the moon. The limits of human activity are being pushed steadily outwards, and to go on pushing seems to be a duty. If something new can be done it should be done.

But the possible is still not universally identified with the permissible. It is possible to rob a man by brainwashing of his self-possession; but there are millions who would abhor

the practice. Some limits still stand. The danger is that the principle by which limits are set — the duty of respecting nature — is seriously weakened by the refusal, even within the Church, to accept an authoritative statement of what human nature is. If human nature is not definable in its essence, it has no frontiers that can be defended, and the invaders will walk in.

What right has the Catholic minority in this country to campaign against the generally accepted moral standards? Surely majority rule is a sound democratic principle.

Since when have right and wrong been decided by majority vote? Does the will of the majority make an aggressive war of conquest morally good. If that were so, then might would be right, and we should be counting the Napoleons of history among the saints. In any case democracy allows for, and even welcomes, an official political opposition, the duty of which is to restrain the party in power from misusing its majority. Except under totalitarian rule, dissent is allowed, and minority opinions are seriously weighed. The purpose of any government should be the common good, and not just the satisfaction of sectional interests, no matter how large the section may be. I know that in this country Catholics are not compelled to use the legal provision for divorce or to go to indecent plays. They are free to keep to their strict moral code. But you cannot justly claim an equal freedom for those who live by a code which is wrong in itself. The country is not harmed by its citizens whose moral practice is Christian; but it is corrupted and weakened by any kind of depravity. Catholics are doing a public service when they protest against obscenity on the stage and degrading programmes on television. They are not just interfering in the lives of others. They are anxious that their country be a fit place for themselves and their children to live in, and that it earn and keep a reputation for decent human behaviour. Our national character has deteriorated sadly during

the last few decades. If Catholics can stop the rot, more power to them.

Why such great efforts, in the name of Ecumenism, to start a Catholic cult of Luther?

You have given me no evidence to justify your use of the word "cult", so I can answer the question only on reports and reviews that I have myself seen. All of them that I can remember were too short to do justice either to Luther or to his opponents; and some of them made no attempt at a balanced judgment. The only suggestion of a cult was in the giving of praise of Luther as a stalwart Christian and in a statement that his teaching would not now be condemned by the Church. Not one of the ecumenical comments on Luther mentioned that by destroying the unity of Christendom, he became the prime cause of our present need of ecumenism and, though it can be reasonably argued that Luther's abandonment of the Church must be blamed in part on the heavy-handed and unsympathetic treatment he received, his was the decision to start a church in opposition to the one Church in which he had been baptised. That there is much good in his version of Christianity is not surprising: Christianity is good wherever you find it. That he brought warmth of feeling to the worship of God is plain in his actions and writings; but countless contemporaries of his had at least equal enthusiasm and they remained in the Church. As in our day, the rebel is "news" while the loyalist gets on quietly with a real reform.

The doctrines of the Church do not change, whatever some so-called theologians try to tell us. Errors that are denials of those doctrines do not cease to be errors. Luther was gravely in error — for example, about the Sacrifice of the Mass — and he still stands condemned.

How can I answer the charge that recent Popes have tried to exercise a "creeping infallibility"?

If I were you I should ask for examples that support the charge. You may be sure that none will be given you. The nature of papal infallibility, and the conditions of its exercise, have been clearly worked out in the history of the Church and precisely stated in the two Vatican Councils. Definitions of doctrine, whether by a Pope or a Council, are rare and easily recognisable. Less formal kinds of teaching cannot be mistaken for them.

If the charge means that Popes have demanded, for their non-infallible pronouncements, an interior acceptance and assent, the charge should be dismissed. It is not the Popes who make the demand but the whole of Catholic tradition, expressed, for example, by the Second Vatican Council, speaking of the obedience owed to the *magisterium*: "This religious submission of will and mind must be shown in a special way to the authentic teaching authority of the Roman pontiff, even when he is not speaking *ex cathedra*. That is, it must be shown in such a way that his supreme *magisterium* is acknowledged with reverence, and the judgments made by him are sincerely adhered to, according to his manifest mind and will. His mind and will in the matter may be known chiefly either from the character of the documents, from his frequent repetition of the same doctrine, or from his manner of speaking" (Constitution on the Church, 25).

What *does* "creep" these days is the stealthy and persistent campaign to sap papal authority. The phrase "creeping infallibility" is a minor move in the undermining process, a phrase which it seems smart to repeat. Other examples are the false distinction between infallible which is binding and non-infallible which is not binding, and the false statement that encyclicals are not infallible and you can ignore them. If you spot such moves, block them. They are pernicious.

When a country is predominantly Catholic, and the government likewise, is it immoral for the government to legalise abortion and divorce ?

It is immoral for any government to legalise abortion and divorce. Both are contrary to the law of God. To practice them is evil, to make the practice lawful according to the civil law is still more evil: it flouts God's will and it sanctions and multiplies offences against Him. The Government you mention would not even have the excuse of pressure by a majority in favour of wicked legislation. On all counts it would be justified in resisting demands for such laws by a minority. If, because of some strange election result, or some unusual appointments to Government posts, or some defection from their faith of a Catholic majority of voters, a predominantly Catholic government should have to answer a very strong demand for laws permitting abortion and divorce, its answer should be a flat refusal. It should, if government is parliamentary, use its majority in parliament to reject bills proposing the immoral statutes. If it then has to resign and hold new elections, it should accept the likelihood of defeat. To buy political power by committing sin is contemptible, corrupting — and very short-sighted. The picture in the Apocalypse of the opening of the books, so that God may judge every man according to the entries in them, should make legislators reluctant to have the passing of evil laws in their record.

A Catholic minister in a government which proposes to initiate legislation of that kind should exert his influence to block the proposal. If he fails in his attempt, he should resign. In a country where the constitution requires the signature of the Head of State before measures passed by the legislative body can become law, the Head of State should refuse to sign in denial of the law of God.

Book Review

SCARS FROM THE GREAT DEPRESSION

Hard Times (An Oral History of the Great Depression) by Studs Terkel; Allen Lane The Penguin Press, £3.15; pp. 462.

I can't remember when I was last so deeply absorbed in a book. For when you get into it, which is on page 1, you forget that you are reading and instead fancy that you are listening to men and women talking about their lives, or the lives of their parents, during the great Depression in the United States which lasted from 1929 until 1939.

Just think of the magnitude of that disaster. In 1936 there were *fifteen million* unemployed out of a work force of 40 million, 39½ per cent; in 1939 there were still ten million unemployed. 'There were great queues of guys in the soup lines.' 'And people starved on the street and on streetcars. I knew a resident at People's Hospital. Every day, he told me, somebody would faint on a streetcar. They would bring him in, and they wouldn't ask any questions . . . Hunger. When he regained consciousness, they'd give him something to eat. People were flopping on the streets from hunger'. There were thousands of people out of work in Oklahoma City. 'I knew one family there, a man and a woman and seven children lived in a hole in the ground . . . They had chairs and tables and beds back in that hole. And they had the dirt braced up there, just like a cave.' And pigs killed and buried, and oranges set on fire. 'Dorothy Comingore, a former film actress (*Citizen Kane*), recalls, "I saw heaps of oranges covered with gasoline and set on fire and men who tried to take *one* orange shot to death"' In Wisconsin 92 per cent of the people were on welfare in the early years of the Depression. All through the Twenties about 600 banks a year were shut down. That was before the Crash, when things were booming. In '29 and '30 banks

closed by the thousands. People were taking headers out of fourteen-storey windows.

No wonder older people explain that if you did not live through the Depression you can't understand *anything*. Politically you are an innocent before Herod's massacre. You talk of wounds and scars who never felt a scratch.

But some of the young have remembered. Listen to Steve, a twenty-one-year-old talking about his mother. "It [the Depression] means something very personal to me. My mother graduated high school when she was young and had a chance to go to college. But she had to go to work, her parents were starving. Her life since has been one unremitting struggle to make do. I think of dreams people had they were forced to give up in order to stay in American society . . . Crushed hope." And Marshall is twenty-three and speaks for millions all over the world:

"In a lot of young people's minds today, [the Depression] is proof of the irrationality of this kind of economic system. After all, there were all those factories, and all those people who wanted to work. There was the equipment. Yet nothing was being worked. Today, if we had great storehouses of grain if they wouldn't be opened up immediately to feed people who are starving, people would take guns and see that they were opened up. People are not imprisoned by the idea that you don't have a right to food. Why should people starve to death when there is food?" It was in this kind of mood that a group of youngsters invaded the stock exchange and burnt money and threw the dollar bills down from the balcony. There was a scramble on the floor of the exchange for the dollar bills. Money is not sacred. You do not jump out of a fourteen-storey building unless you worship it.

The author, Studs Terkel, took a tape recorder around the country and asked all kinds of people what they remembered of the Great Depression. He changed nothing, merely editing for length, and the result is a really wonderful anthology of American speech and American memories. He calls it a memory book. With his great experience — he

has a daily programme on radio in Chicago which covers interviews, readings and documentaries — and his compassion, he has managed to persuade people to speak out of the depths of their experience. They speak bluntly and forcefully. If they want to swear they swear. If they want to be emotional and on the brink of tears, there is that wonderful discretion and loving sympathy which encourages without the need of a word. Studs Terkel is a very rare and very special kind of human being.

The great question is: could we have another Depression? We will look at three answers to this question. The first from Dr. Arthur F. Burns, head of the Federal Reserve Board, almost amounts to a confession that in June 1970 the United States was as near a financial smash as it has been since the "bankers' panic" of 1907. The situation was as follows: "The Dow-Jones Industrial Average had dropped from a high of 985 in December, 1968, to 631 on May 26, a 7½-year low and a decline of 36 per cent, wiping out hundreds of billions in paper values" (*Christian Science Monitor*, 31 December 1970). Money was so tight that to borrow it on prime security was the highest of the century. Unemployment was rising to 5.8 per cent, and retail prices to 5 per cent. On 21 June the Penn Central Railroad conglomerate collapsed: 'the biggest bankruptcy in history'. The panic was on. Dr. Arthur F. Burns and his colleagues acted: they took the virtually *unprecedented step* of informing all the largest banks across the country that the Fed would stand behind them. The Fed also gave banks the freedom to bid for funds in the market and thus make loans to those borrowers who needed the money quickly but were otherwise solvent. In the discreet phrase of Dr. Burns the Fed's intervention may have stopped a "wave of fear" from sweeping the financial community.

Dorothy Day in the book under review gave a most interesting series of answers to Studs Terkel but ended up by saying:

"Another Depression might be a relief to many people. They

know our prosperity is built on war. People won't have to keep up a front any longer. They wouldn't have to keep up the payments any more. There would have to be a moratorium. The threat of Depression is nothing to worry about. I wish to goodness the stock market would collapse for good and for all. I'd like to see a non-violent revolution take place and an end to this Holy War . . ." Another person interviewed when asked if another Depression could come again said: "I think it could. But it would behove the Federal Government not to let it come. Because you're dealing with a different breed of cat now . . . My sixteen-year-old son is not the person I was when I was sixteen . . . When I was sixteen, I wasn't afraid to die. But the kid, sixteen now, is not afraid to kill." And finally from the book, when Alf M. Landon, two-term Governor of Kansas was asked: What about Roosevelt? He answered: "He brought this country out of it. You bet. I remember it. I'm afraid we're gonna have another one . . ."

All those who adore the capitalist system will be pleased to hear the final answer to the question as to the likelihood of another Depression. Soviet economists have over the years come to believe that the capitalist system in the United States is rock solid. The folklore of an inevitable depression has been discarded. They no longer gossip about an irremediable structural crisis of the US economy.

Around about 1950 the Hungarian economist Professor Varga wrote that capitalism as it existed in the United States had built-in safeguards which made a depression of the nature of the 1929 one improbable.

Eugene Varga's hypothesis has recently been confirmed at a conference of the Institute of World Economics and International Relations. At this conference an economist, V. Lan, discounted the notion that because the value of securities on the New York Stock Exchange had fallen to an all-time low that therefore a serious capitalist depression was around the corner. He pointed out that a slump in the value of shares does not necessarily mean a crisis in the

economy. Furthermore the old thesis that there would be ever increasing unemployment in the capitalist West has been abandoned. What the forces of production cannot use in the way of man and woman power can be and has been absorbed by service industries and health and education.

But to finish with the book under review. The chapter with Dr. Lewis Andreas in it, who founded (along with others) Chicago's first medical centre; group practice and low fees, is worth reading and pondering. Scared cops — fifty on the strike picket line shot, 10 of them died — newspaper misrepresentation — the hopeful voice of F.D.R. — and American society saved by the war made by Hitler. Dr. Andreas ends: "My habit of life has been changed by the Depression. I'm sitting here in this office . . . these wounds are permanent. My father was a doctor, and his life's savings were in one piece of property. It was foreclosed on him by the University of Chicago, and he lost every cent he had. They simply took it away because they had the legal right to take it away. And he taught at Rush Medical College (an adjunct of the University of Chicago at the time) for twelve years for nothing. (Laughs) So there was no help from Papa any more. I had planned research work, but the Depression got me into this — I don't have too many regrets. I would have been a nice rich guy probably, with a practice . . . I would have been one of many other fellows. As it is, I'm myself, unique, as they say. (Smiles) I have no regrets."

The book is full of unique people — most of them fundamentally decent — the best preservative of rotten systems.

E. L. Way